Application No. Applicant(s) 10/085,813 WOJCIK ET AL. Interview Summary Examiner Art Unit Scott Haugland 3654 All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel): (1) Neal Pierotti. (3) Scott Haugland. (2) Kathy Matecki. (4)_____. Date of Interview: 21 June 2005 Type: a) Telephonic b) Video Conference c) Personal [copy given to: 1] applicant 2) applicant's representative Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) Yes e) 🛛 No. If Yes, brief description: _____. Claim(s) discussed: _____. Identification of prior art discussed: _____. Agreement with respect to the claims f) \square was reached. g) $\not\square$ was not reached. h) \square N/A. Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: _see. be lo w (A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.) THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet. Discussed obviousness of combining Morizzo & Kammann, Discussed obviousness of using vacuum belt of type disclosed by applicants. Discussed possibility of adding stripping device to remove web roll from mandrel to claims. Ex'r noted that web roll stripping apparatus are known & Johnson otal has vacuum craveyor (vacuum roll). why Walecke

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

Examiner's signature, if required